I reside in an area where Internet service is not available via DSL or Cable TV. I have followed with interest the efforts to bring high speed internet to "us rural" folks. I am a short wave listener and an amateur radio operator (WA4WPD).

I have experienced first hand the BPL problems in the Raleigh NC (Wake county) area. I have some concerns with the existing BPL as proposed in North Carolina.

Please examine the BPL testing methodology. It seems to be incomplete. It appears that situations that would reflect negatively on BPL were omitted.

May I suggest a requirement to demonstrate BPL effectiveness where individual customers are located on 10 acre or greater lots? Since this is both a proof of technology and proof of a business model, I would like to see deployment estimates of time and costs. I am currently trying to decide if satellite Internet would be viable for my situation. Answers to this will alter my decision.

May I suggest a requirement to demonstrate BPL effectiveness in the neighborhood of active amateur radio operators? The test should included BPL results during amateur radio contests. The ability of BPL to tolerate amateur radio operators utilizing multiple bands in response to changing atmospheric conditions would be of concern. How would BPL react to being assaulted on 14 Mhz, then 21 Mhz, then 28 Mhz then, 21 Mhz then 7 Mhz then 3 Mhz? The speed of BPL's reaction should be paramount.

I use the Internet during amateur radio contests. BPL must be able to co-exist with me. The existing demonstration of BPL might be able to work for the amateur radio hobby, but then I'm affected when I listen to shortwave. By the industries own admission they can only shift and/or notch just so much. How are they going to accommodate when both an amateur operation and a short wave listener are serviced by the same segment?

During the Raleigh NC test BPL was negatively impacted by Amateur Radio transmissions. If this is true then BPL would not work for me. I am also concerned that complaints concerning BPL could cause the utility to disconnect power service. Please address this in your rulemaking provisions.

May I suggest a requirement to demonstrate BPL effectiveness in neighborhoods with active public service operators? How will high power AM and FM transmitters affect BPL? Will public service transmitters be a concern? What about stateside shortwave broadcasters on 5, 7 ,9, 11, 15 and 17 Mhz? Has the BPL industry considered all the possible intermod problems to themselves?

May I suggest a requirement to demonstrate BPL effectiveness in complaint management? I have both fixed station at my residence and a mobile station. Progress Energy has already stated they have no intention to ease problems they cause to my mobile operations (http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2004/04/22/2/). Does this mean

I only matter to them when I am at home? Does the FCC only care what I do when I'm at home?

So how will they react to fixed operations? How will I inform them where problems are? Can they react fast enough so I can make that rare contact that just appeared on the packet cluster? What would be my recourse if they fail to mitigate their interference? These need to answered before implementation.

In the last decade the power grid that services me has been severely damaged twice. On both occasions it took days (in one case weeks) to rebuild the grid. How will the "out of town" (or for hurricane Fran the "three state away") crew handle the BPL equipment? Will they be trained on it? Will the BPL equipment be safe? Will the BPL be controllable during these times? Will interference be a problem? In both of these instances cell phones and wired phones were inoperable. Amateur Radio was the only means of communications for days. The FCC needs to ensure that these questions are answered before BPL is allowed to continue.

May I suggest that you require all BPL devices be designed to go inert if said equipment suffers any loss of contact with it's control point?

I also have a concern of Progress Energy's system causing world wide problems. Other countries of the world have halted HF spectrum BPL. What do they know that we don't?

It seems to me that the use of HF spectrum for BPL is backwards. The FCC should encourage forward technology, not older technology that can mire the public and itself in old issues. Wouldn't 5 Ghz be a better place for BPL technology?

If you allow BPL in it's current form is allow to continue, I would ask that Part 15 requirements be strengthened. It appears that the BPL industry wants to expand the scope of a Part 15 device to one that can intentionally radiate over expansive geographic areas. This seems to violate the spirit of Part 15.

The BPL industry should be required to work with all the US citizens without regard their legal hobbies. The BPL industry should be required to fully explain to all their customers they knew beforehand that interference was a concern. They must accept any interference into their system and not blame any one. Any comment degrading or blaming any FCC licensed service over BPL problems must be met with fines and/or a cease of operations order from the FCC. They should submit to the public and the FCC verifiable RF radiation studies.

The BPL industry must be held responsible for any problems they cause.

The HF spectrum is shared by many users domestic and foreign. The FCC should insure the protection of the HF spectrum. Please encourage BPL advocates to examine newer technologies. The very nature of HF means any "pollution", "over there" , comes "over here" and vise a versa. Let the United States be a good actor in

the use of HF. Let’s don’t pollute the rest of the world.

Thank you for your considerations in this matter.

Robin D Keller
3377 Winterberry Lane
Nashville NC 27856